

ON THE SEMANTICS OF CONNECTIVES IN EAST ARMENIAN

DORA SAKAYAN
McGILL UNIVERSITY

The paper¹ focuses on the East Armenian infinitive and particularly the synthetic nominalized infinitive (SNI), with which complete sentences can be transformed into nominal phrases. In a factive context the SNI behaves as a fact-nominalization. This observation concerns the SNI not only in subject position, but in its other sentential functions as well. This is particularly evident in its use with certain connectives (predominantly postpositions) which suggests, by analogy with Kiparsky/Kiparsky (1970) who formulated the binarity of factive / non-factive predicates, that a

1. This article is the expanded version of the paper "On Factive / non-Factive Connectives in Natural Languages" which I presented in August 1987 at the XIV International Congress of Linguists in East Berlin.

similar binarity be postulated for factive / non-factive connectives.

The aim of this paper is to illustrate the role played by semantic factors in facilitating the syntactic compatibility of linguistic signs on the evidence of different types of the East Armenian infinitive with *kaps*². As I have shown in *Formen der Textkohärenz* (Sakayan 1986a), the Armenian infinitive occurs as a verbal infinitive (with the feature +V) and as a nominal infinitive (with the feature +N).

Examples of the +V infinitive:

grel 'to write' and *kardal* 'to read,' with *gr-* and *kard-* as the stems.

The +N infinitive appears with an actualizer appropriate for nouns:

a) with the definite article *-ə* / *-n*:³ *grel-ə* 'the writing'
kardal-ə 'the reading'

b) with the deictic-possessive or personal article:

grel-s 'my writing'

kardal-d 'your reading'

gal-ə 'his / her coming'⁴

2. *kap* 'connector' from *kapel* 'to connect.' *Kaps* correspond to pre- or postpositions in European languages.

3. Both *-ə* and *-n* are allomorphs of the same definite article: *-ə* usually after consonants (*muk* 'mouse' and *mukə* 'the mouse'), *-n* after vowels (*katu* 'cat' and *katun* 'the cat') as well as before another word starting with a vowel:

Mukn u katun.

(mouse-the and cat-the)

'the mouse and the cat.'

4. Note the homonymity of the forms with the definite article and the deictic-possessive article (*grel-ə* 'the writing' and 'his / her writing'). There exists a whole paradigm for all three

The Armenian infinitive in its unmarked forms occurs much less frequently in text than do the marked forms. The determination paradigm of the infinitive has developed by analogy with the nominal paradigm. Compare the determination paradigm of a noun (cf. *mard* 'human being, man, person') and an infinitive (cf. *grel* 'to write'):

'indefinite'
mard 'man'

'definite'
mardə 'the man'

'definite-possessive'
mards 'my man'

'indefinite'
grel 'to write'
(+V infinitive)

persons in both singular and plural:

Singular

grel-s 'my writing'

grel-d 'your writing'

grel-ə 'his / her writing'

Plural

grelner-s 'our writing'

grelner-d 'your writing'

grelner-ə 'their writing'

'definite-general'
grelə 'the writing'
(+N infinitive)

'definite-possessive'
grels 'my writing'
(+N infinitive)

One of the characteristic features of these three subcategories of the infinitive is their ability to be declined with inflections of the nominal *u*-paradigm (Abrahamian 1981: 151, Asatryan 1983 1983: 79).

The declined forms can be governed by the verb node from which they depend:

(1) *Vaxenum em ays marduc*. 'This man frightens me.'

(2) *Vaxenum em partveluc*. 'I am afraid of being defeated.'

In both (1) and (2) the ablative case is used for the noun *mard* and the infinitive *partvel* 'to be defeated,' as governed by the finite verb *vaxenal* 'to be afraid, to be frightened.'

The infinitive is integrated into a syntactic sequence not only via its inflexions but also by connectives or adpositions, called *kaps*, corresponding to European pre- or postpositions, most often realized as postpositions⁵.

Like prepositions in European languages, *kaps* indicate various dependence relationships, governing backwards or forwards the case of the accompanying noun or the +V or +N infinitive:

(3) *mardu masin*

'about a person'

(4) *grelu masin*

5. Armenian, as a SOV language (Seiler 1975), prefers postpositions.

‘about writing’

where *masin* governs regressively the genitive case, and

(5) *bac'i marduc'*

‘except for the man’

(6) *bac'i greloc'*

‘besides the writing’

where *bac'i* stands before the ablative.

Not every *kap* can combine with an infinitive: the restrictions are semantic in nature. Djahukian has produced a compatibility table for *kaps* vis-à-vis what he calls ‘material’ nouns (proper substantives) and infinitives in general (*anoroš derbay*) (Djahukian 1974:329-330). He counts, out of a total of 86 *kaps*, 15 prepositions and 41 postpositions which are compatible with the infinitive. He fails to note, however, the crucial distinction between +V infinitives and +N infinitives, and the division of +N infinitives according to their general or personal determination, which implies differences in the meaning of infinitive + *kap* constructions, i.e. in the compatibility of a *kap* with an infinitive.

Thus, some *kaps* are compatible with infinitives without person markers, others with infinitives with such markers; some are not so restricted. Table 1 (following) shows two such groups of *kaps*.

The constructions *kap* + unmarked infinitive fulfill, for example, adverbial functions:

Purpose constructions:

(7) *grely npatakov* ‘in order to write’

(8) *kardalu hamar* ‘in order to read’

Modal constructions:

(9) *grely miȭoc'ov* ‘by dint of writing’

(10) *aranc' kardalu* ‘without reading’

(11) *xoselu p'oxaren* ‘instead of talking’

Or, conditional constructions:

(12) *grelu depk'um* 'in case (one) writes.'

Note the use of this type of phrase in the following sentences:

(13) *Na ekav grelu npatakov.*

'He / she came in order to write'

(14) *Ařanc' kardalu č'es karol haskanal.*

'You cannot understand without reading'

In examples (7)–(12) we are concerned with the +V infinitive in the function of an 'Inhaltsinfinitiv'⁶ as a free complement to the predicate, i.e. to denote a secondary action which determines the primary action expressed by the finite verb. The action of the infinitive + *kap* construction is usually attributed to the agent of the finite verb; thus the subject of both actions is identical, as in (13) and (14).

Other *kaps* from the same left column form constructions which refer to actions in general, independent of both the subject and the predicate.

(15) *Ařxatelu tesaketic' na řat lav ř.*

'With regard to work[ing] he is very good.'

(16) *Tetap'oxvelu utlut'yamb č'xosec'ink'.*

'We did not speak about moving.'

In (15) and (16) the infinitives *ařxatel* and *tetap'oxvel* denote actions in general, and must be considered as part of the general determination paradigm. Their initial form, therefore, must be regarded as *ařxatel* '[the] working' or *tetap'oxvel* '[the] moving.' When used with the thematic connectives⁷ *tesaketic'* and *utlut'yamb* they act like indirect objects, acquiring complete independence from the subject. There can therefore be no question of the identity of the subjects in sentences (15) and (16).

In examples (7)–(16) the lack of a personal marker denotes an

6. See Sakayan (1986a: 37–56) on 'Inhaltsinfinitiv.'

7. For thematic connectives see below and tables 2 and 3.

action, rather than incorporating an entire proposition with agent specification.

Unlike the +V or the +N infinitive with the actualizer \rightarrow and its relatively simple structure, the nominalized infinitive with the personal or deictic-possessive article, which I have called SNI (synthetic nominalized infinitive: see Sakayan 1986a/b), can have a more complex structure: from one to four inflexions, adjuncted to the right (A, B and C) and one (Z) to the left of the infinitive, where A is the plural marker; B the case marker; C the person marker, the actualizer presented by the deictic-possessive or personal article; and Z is the negation marker. A, B and C are inflexions of nominal, and Z of verbal origin. All of them appear in a secondary function (Kuryłowicz 1973) and mark an indirect reference to reality (Sakayan 1986a).

Only the situator C is obligatory for an SNI, which derives from deictic utterances and particularly from finite verbal forms, being the indirect reference to the agent expressed by the personal pronoun:

(17) *Es grum em.* \rightarrow (17a) *grels*⁸ (NI+C)

'I am writing.' \rightarrow 'my writing'

More complex forms may encompass within the SNI different underlying information. Consider:

(18) *Menk' grum enk'.* \rightarrow (18a) *grelners1* (NI + A + C)

'We are writing.' \rightarrow 'our writing' (writing[plur]-mine)

(19) *Es mišt grum em.* \rightarrow (19a) *grelners2* (NI + A + C)

'I always write.' \rightarrow 'my repeated writing' (writing[plur]-mine)

(20) *Menk' mišt grum enk'.* \rightarrow (20a) *grelners3* (NI + A + C)

8. Like nominalizations in general, these too are indifferent to time: *grels* 'my writing' can be seen equally as derived from *grum em* - 'I am writing / I write,' *grum êi / grec'i* 'I was writing / I have written,' or *grelu em* 'I will write' etc.

'We always write.' → 'our repeated writing' (writing [plur]mine)

where the plural marker A can refer to a plurality of agents (18a), to the frequency (iterativity) of action (19a), or to both (20a).

In addition to these right-adjuncted nominal inflexions, the SNI can have the verbal left-adjuncted negation marker č'-:

(21) *Es č'em grum.* → (21a) *č'grels* (Z + NI + C)

'I am not writing.' → 'my not-writing'

(22) *Menk' č'enk' grum.* → (22a) *č'grelners* (Z + NI + A + C)

'We are not writing.' → 'our not-writing' (not-writing [plur]mine)

And now these forms with *kaps*:

(23) *grelus masin* (NI + B + C)

'about my writing'

(24) *grelneris masin* (NI + A + B + C)

'about my/our (repeated) writing'

(25) *č'grelus masin* (Z+ NI + B + C)

'about my not-writing'

(26) *č'grelneris masin* (Z + NI + A + B + C)

'about my / our not-writing'

Thus, an SNI can vary from a minimal to a maximal structure:

1. NI + C see (17a)
2. NI + A + C see (18a), (19a) and (20a)
3. Z + NI + C see (21a)
4. Z + NI + A + C see (22a)
5. NI + B + C as in (23)
6. NI + A + B + C as in (24)
7. Z + NI + B + C as in (25)
8. Z + NI + A + B + C as in (26)

The SNI can serve as the core of nominal phrases of varying length, which result from intralinguistic transformations:

(27) *Es namak (č')em grum.* → (27a) *Namak (č')grels*

'I am (not) writing a letter.' → 'my (not) writing a letter'

(28) *Es nran namak (č')em grum.* → (26a) *Nran namak (č')grels*

'I am (not) writing him / her a letter. → 'my (not) writing him/her a letter'

(29) *Es nran aysor namak (č')em grum.* →

'I am (not) writing him a letter today.'

(29a) *Nran aysor namak (č')grels*

'my (not) writing him a letter today'

Complete sentences are readily compressed via the SNI into simple formations and more complex constructions, entering into more complex sentence structures as stylistic synonyms of subordinate clauses introduced by conjunctions. For example:

(30) *Na ekav grelus žamanak.*

'He/she came during my writing.'

(31) *Na ekav, erb grum èi.*

'He/she came while I was writing.'

The main function, however, of the SNI is to express an indirect reference to a given proposition.

The transition from a sentence to a nominal phrase can acquire trans-sentential meaning; thus, as I attempted to show in Sakayan 1986a, the SNI can operate as an anaphor. The emphasis here is on the semantic properties of the SNI as a parole-derivative indicating that the proposition in question carries information already communicated by the linguistic context or by the situation. The referent of the SNI formation or SNI construction seems to be a discourse entity already familiar to the locutors or else shared knowledge 'as taken by the speaker to be part of the hearer's general knowledge store' (Prince 1985: 66). Consequently an infinitive with a personal marker implies that the proposition in question has already been entertained textually or is known situationally and is taken for granted; the infinitive without a personal marker simply refers to a non-familiar, unknown action at the moment of speaking. Thus, the distinction drawn in Table 1

between *kaps* which are compatible with marked and unmarked infinitives corresponds to a semantic distinction which can be seen when we consider a polyfunctional connective which with or without a person marker can signal different meanings. Compare *hamar* 'in order to' with 'for / because of'⁹:

purpose meaning: *grelu hamar* – 'in order to write' (non-familiar information)

causal meaning: *grelus hamar* – 'because of my writing / for my writing' (familiar information)

The form and the meaning of certain combinations is thus predictable; purpose constructions do not take person markers and do not convey the meaning of familiarity or shared knowledge, whereas causal constructions are usually person-marked and display the semantic property of familiarity.

Empirical observation shows that some of these *kap* + infinitive constructions bear in certain contexts a specific semantic implication which is 'factivity,' as used in Kiparsky/Kiparsky's (1970) sense to indicate the speaker's presupposition that a given complement will convey a true proposition. Whereas the meaning of givenness (i.e. the anaphoric meaning, or shared knowledge) is inherent in all SNI constructions, the presence of the factive meaning is not obligatory. Since shared knowledge allows us to make inferences about a speaker's beliefs (Hutchinson 1985: 13), it is shared knowledge which provides the basis for factivity. Thus, factivity is a derivation from shared knowledge. In this regard, my approach seems to coincide with Arutjunova (1980/1985), who offers a comprehensive analysis of the Russian semantics of an

9. Cf. the interpretation of *hamar* in Aghayan (1976: 805)

independent sentence transferred to a subject or object position.¹⁰ She offers the term пропозитивное значение 'propositional meaning' and assigns to it the hierarchical status of a 'supra-notion,' superior to factivity itself. In my understanding, this 'propositional meaning' corresponds to the 'meaning of familiarity' or 'meaning of givenness' and hence the 'anaphoric meaning' which is present in every SNI formation or construction.

Now, in my earlier study I distinguished between explicit and implicit fact-nominalizations, identifying the former as those specifically incorporating such formulae as 'the fact that,' *die Tatsache, daß, le fait que, тот факт, что* etc., whereas the latter convey the same meaning without such overt 'fact formulae' and are expressed by a gerundial, participial or nominal construction. Consider, for example, the two syntagmas:

(32) *Gišerov ayntel mnald*

'Your staying there overnight' (implicit)

(33) *Ayn (p'astə), or gišerov ayntel mnac'ir*

'The fact that you stayed there overnight' (explicit)

Obviously, these two sequences incorporate structurally distinct but semantically identical signs, if we consider them in a factive context. As we know from Kiparsky/Kiparsky (1970), factivity depends on the semantic properties, the factive status, of the particular predicate involved.

(34) *Gišerov ayntel mnald inj netum ê. (factive)*

'Your staying there overnight bothers me.'

10. From the extensive literature on factivity that has appeared since Kiparsky/Kiparsky's study of 1970, Arutjunova's (1980 and 1985) system of semantic features of predication would seem to be the best elaborated. Both articles, based on Russian material, offer a comprehensive analysis of the semantics of an independent sentence transferred to a subject position.

(35) *Gišerov ayntet mnald hnaravor ê*. (non-factive)

'Your staying there overnight is possible.'

In (34) and (35) the factive vs. non-factive meaning of the SNI *mnald* - 'your staying' reflects the factive vs. non-factive status of the predicate involved. As suggested by Kiparsky/Kiparsky (1970), it is *netum ê* 'bothers me' which creates the factive context, whereas *hnaravor ê* 'it is possible' lacks this meaning.

Although the semantic feature of factivity is recognized to exist in all natural languages, it appears that some languages prefer implicit fact-nominalizations, while in others we find a prevalence of explicit fact-nominalizations. An example of the latter type of language is Russian, with its high-frequency fact-formula *то факт, что*, which is able to transform any and all sentences into subordinate clauses (Stepanov 1981: 195). In contrast, East Armenian, like English, allows both explicit and implicit forms, though the latter, i.e. those with an SNI, occur more frequently. Intralinguistically, both types of fact-nominalizations are semantically interchangeable, but in informal speech implicit fact-nominalizations are preferred for their brevity.

Studies to date have concentrated on nominalizations in the subject and the direct object position, and according to their factive or non-factive predicate. The SNI expresses primarily a 'given' (Sakayan 1986a: 223) and not necessarily the 'theme' or 'topic' in the sense of Halliday's distinction between 'given' and 'new' (1970:163). The feature of 'givenness' allows the SNI to occur in all positions in a sentence. Let us examine the presence of factivity vs. non-factivity in the SNI in a variety of functions other than subject and direct object, i.e. in those typical of nominal phrases, including predicative, attributive, and circumstantial or adverbial.

(36) *Č'greld inj netum ê*. (subject)

'The fact that you don't / didn't write troubles me.'

(37) *Č'grels antesum es. (object)*¹¹

'You ignore (the fact) that I don't / didn't write.'

(38) *Inj netotə č'grelđ ê. (predicate)*

'What troubles me is (the fact) that you don't / didn't write.'

(39) *Č'grelus patčarə džvar ê bac'atrel. (attribute)*

'The reason that I don't / didn't write is difficult to explain.'

In (36)–(39) the SNI shows syntactic function by its inflexion, in other cases by *kaps* and inflection:

(40) *Č'grelus patčarov inj morac'ar. (adverbial)*

'Due to the fact that I don't / didn't write, you have forgotten me.'

I observe that the factivity of nominalizations can appear in all sentence functions regardless of the semantic features of the predicate, i.e. also below the level of the main clause, in a subordinate clause and even within a phrase. Factivity / non-factivity can be observed in parallel subordinate clauses both in Armenian and European languages. Let us examine a few combinations with *kaps* from the right hand column of Table 1 as subdivided in Table 2 (following):

Among the thematic group of *kaps* the most common one is *masin* 'about,' the postposition which most often links an indirect object to a predicate (Djahukian 1974: 463). Referring always to the subject of the conversation, it can stand as a generic term for several thematic *kaps*, such as *vra* 'on,' 'at,' *veraberyal* 'concerning,' *šurj* 'with regard to,' *hamar* 'for,' etc.

A distinct set of verbs governs an SNI in its factive meaning

11. Note that the number of predicates compatible with an SNI as a direct object is extremely limited. This is due to the reiterative character of SNI constructions. Since these formations presuppose an indirect reference to the information conveyed, they do not fit well into the direct object slot.

by means of *masin*, embracing a wide semantic spectrum.

1. verba dicendi:

(41) *Patmec'i / zekuc'ec'i / ergec'i / harc'rec'i SNI + masin.*

'I told (him) / I reported / I sang / I asked about p.'

2. verbs denoting mental activity:

(42) *datum em / hišum em / mořanum em SNI + masin.*

'I judge / I remember / I forget about p'

3. emotive verbs:

(43) *Mtahogvum em / řtaynanum em / mtacum em SNI+masin.*

'I am concerned / angry / worried about p'

4. cognitive verbs:

(44) *Telekanum em / telyak em / gitem / lsum em SNI + masin.*

'I find out / I am informed / I know / I hear about p'

Thus we can see that the postposition *masin* is easily combined with any SNI, irrespective of context:

(45) *galud / gnalud ř'gnalud etc. masin*

'about your coming / going not-coming not-going' etc.

The same factive meaning holds for SNI formations with the negation ř'-, which tends to reinforce factivity and therefore can be used in tests to prove factivity:

(46) *telekac'a ř'galud / ř'gnalud / ř'grelud / ř'kardalud masin*

'I found out about your not-coming / not-going / not-writing / not-reading.'

The synthetic formula SNI + *masin* 'about p' corresponds to the formula *ayn (p'asti) masin* or p 'about the fact that p,' which expresses factivity explicitly:

(47) *Ayn (p'asti) masin, or eka / gnac'i / ř'eka / ř'gnac'i etc.*

'about the fact that I came / went / didn't come / didn't go' etc.

Unlike the SNI in the function of subject or direct object of a sentence, which has the option of being combined with either

factive or non-factive predicates, this SNI + *masin* construction is restricted to the above-mentioned group of factive verbs.

There are other thematic connectives which are not as common as *masin*, but which, when governed by a certain semantic group of verbs, also behave factively with an SNI (see Table 2).

(49) *Bolorn inj govum en lav ašxatelus hamar.*

'Everybody is praising me for the fact that I am working well.'

The above-mentioned thematic group, however, tends to appear also in connection with an unmarked infinitive:

(50) *Es č'em uzum xosel sovorelu masin.*

'I don't want to talk about studying.'

This infinitive refers to the action *sovorel* 'to study' in general and consequently is not an SNI. There can be no anaphoric and consequently no factive meaning in such cases.

The next group of postpositions that behave factively are the ones which denote causal-concessive relations.

(51) *Erek eka SNI + paččarov.*

'I came yesterday because of (the fact that) p.'

Or:

(52) *Erek eka SNI + handerj.*

'I came yesterday, despite the fact that p/ even though p.'

As a test of factivity, I include parallel formations with or without the negation marker:

(53) *Gnac'i k'ez tesnelus / č'tesnelus paččarov.*

'I left because (of the fact) that I saw / I didn't see you.'

Parallel synonymous explicit constructions of the type (54) can be evidence of factivity:

(54) *Gnac'i ayn (p'asti) paččarov, or p.*

'I left because of the fact that p.'

The semantic characteristics of a predicate are irrelevant to the factivity expressed in these constructions.

There are, however, pre- or postpositions which in connection

with the SNI do not behave factively, even though the propositions concerned seem to be discourse entities familiar to the speech partners. These include primarily the temporal connectives + SNI, which belong to certain linguistic forms presupposing, as Gundel (1985) would suggest, only 'familiarity with a discourse entity and not necessarily belief in the truth of a corresponding proposition (Gundel 1985: 83).

(55) *Naxk'an gnals amen inč' verjac'ri.*

'Before leaving I finished everything.'

Testing with an explicit fact-formula supports this observation:

(56) **Naxk'an ayn p'astə, or gnac'i, amen inč' verjac'ri.*

*'Before the fact that I left, I finished everything.'

Testing with the negation marker also bears out the lack of factivity in these cases.

(57) **Naxk'an č'gnals inč' verjac'ri.*

*'Before my not-leaving I finished everything.'

The set of temporal connectives tends to convey the meaning of familiarity of a given discourse entity *p*, without any precise indication of factivity. This becomes especially obvious when the main verbal node expresses an unaccomplished action:

(58) *Gnaluc'd heto č'em karot hetd xosel.*

'After you leave I cannot talk to you.'

It is no accident that in many languages the preposition 'after' can convey factivity, provided it is used in its causal meaning. Thus, in Armenian in (58) the construction *gnaluc'd heto* refers to a fact if the postposition *heto* is read as 'since' and the SNI *gnaluc'd* is read in the past:

'Since you have left, I cannot talk to you.'

German shows a similar equivocal use of the conjunction *nachdem* 'after' or 'since,' as the context may suggest.

(59) *Nachdem wir zustimmen, kauft er das Haus.*

'After we agree he will buy the house.' (temporal meaning = non-factive).

(60) *Nachdem wir zugestimmt haben, müssen wir nun unser Wort halten.*

'Since we agreed, we have to keep our promise.' (causal meaning = factive).

The self-evident semantic distinction between factivity and non-factivity of these phrases should allow us to consider the binarity factive vs. non-factive *kaps* (connectives), which can be classed as factive provided they express thematic (*masin* 'about'), causal (*patčarov* 'because of') or concessive (*handerj* 'despite') relations and are used with an SNI. Other *kaps*, e.g. purpose (*npatakov* 'in order to'), conditional (*depk'um* 'in case of'), or modal (*aranc* 'without'), lack factivity and are typically not combinable with an SNI. The temporal *kaps* (*pes* 'as soon as' and others) are indifferent to any expression of factivity although they refer to shared knowledge when used with an SNI (see Table 3, following).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abrahamian, Sergey G. (Աբրահամյան, Սերգեյ Գ.)
1981 *Ժամանակակից գրական հայերեն (Modern Literary Armenian)*. Yerevan: Press of the Armenian Academy of Sciences.
- Aghayan, Eduard B. (Աղայան, Էդուարդ Բ.)
1976 *Արդի հայերենի բացատրական բառարան (Lexicon of Modern Armenian)*. Yerevan: Hayastan.
- Asatryan, Manvel E. (Ասատրյան, Մանվել Ե.)
1983 *Հայոց լեզու (Armenian Language)*. Yerevan: Yerevan State University Press.
- Allerton, D.J.
1978 "The Notion of 'Givenness' and its Relations to Presupposition and to Theme." *Lingua* 44: 133-168.
- Arutjunova, Nina D. (Арутюнова, Нина Д.)
1980 "Сокровенная связка. К проблеме предикативного отношения" (*The Secretive Copula. On the Problem of the Predicate Relation*). Известия АН СССР, Серия литературы и языка 4: 347-358.
1985 "Об объекте общей оценки" (*On the Subject of General Valuation*). Вопросы Языкознания 3: 13-24.
- Djahukian, Gevork B. (Ջահուկյան, Գեվորգ Բ.)
1976 *Ժամանակակից հայերենի տեսության հիմունքները (Foundations of Modern Armenian Theory)*. Yerevan: Press of the Armenian Academy of Sciences.
- Gundel, Jeanette K.
1985 "'Shared Knowledge' and Topicality." *Journal of Pragmatics* 9: 83-107.
- Halliday, M.A.K.
1970 "Language Structure and Language Function." *New Horizons in Linguistics*. John Lyons, ed. Pp. 140-165.

- Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Hutchinson, Larry G.
 1985 "Nonlinguistic Beliefs in Linguistics." *Journal of Pragmatics* 9. 109-136.
- Kiparsky, Paul, and Carol Kiparsky.
 1970 "Fact." *Progress in Linguistics*. Manfred Bierwisch and Karl Erich Heidolph, eds. Pp. 143-173. The Hague/Paris: Mouton.
- Kuryłowicz, Jerzy
 1973 "Dérivation lexicale et dérivation syntaxique." *Esquisses linguistiques I*. E. Coseriu ed. Munich. Pp. 41-50.
- Prince, Ellen F.
 1985 "Fancy Syntax and 'Shared Knowledge.'" *Journal of Pragmatics* 9: 65-81.
- Sakayan, Dora
 1986a Formen der Textkohärenz: Nominalisierung als sententiale Anapher in Ostarmenischen. Tübingen: Narr.
 1986b "Transposition or . . . Literary Translation?" *Meta* 31 (4): 377-386.
- Stepanov, Juryi (Степанов, Юрий).
 1981 Имена. Предикаты. Предложения. (*Nomina. Predicates. Sentences*). Moscow: Nauka.

TABLE 1

<i>kaps</i> compatible with person-unmarked infinitives (+V)	<i>kaps</i> compatible with person-marked infinitives (+N)
<i>ařanc</i> 'without' <i>npatakov</i> 'in order to' <i>hamar</i> 'in order to' <i>teř</i> 'in place of' <i>p'oxanak</i> 'instead of' <i>p'oxanen</i> 'instead of' <i>miřoc'ov</i> 'by, by dint of' <i>bac'i</i> 'besides, except' <i>depk'um</i> 'in case of' <i>het metkeř</i> 'in addition to' <i>havasari</i> 'equal to' <i>nman</i> 'like' <i>dimac</i> 'in exchange for' <i>handep</i> 'in relation to' <i>tesaketici</i> 'regarding' <i>kotmic</i> 'with respect to' <i>uřtuř'yamb</i> 'with regard to' <i>nkatmamb</i> 'toward'	<i>masin</i> 'about' <i>řurj</i> 'on' <i>veraberyal</i> 'regarding' <i>vra</i> 'on, about' <i>pařčarov</i> 'because of' <i>řnorhiv</i> 'thanks to, owing to' <i>hetevank'ov</i> 'as a result of' <i>handeri</i> 'despite' <i>ařiti'ov</i> 'on the occasion of' <i>hamar</i> 'due to, because of' <i>heto</i> 'after' <i>ařař</i> 'before' <i>řamanak</i> 'during' <i>miřoc'in</i> 'at the moment of' <i>ařni'ac'k'um</i> 'during' <i>mini'ev</i> 'until' <i>naxk'an</i> 'before' <i>pes</i> 'as soon as, upon' <i>i ver</i> 'since'

TABLE 2

<i>kaps</i> (connectives) used with a SNI (synthetic nominalized infinitive)		
thematic <i>kaps</i>	causal-concessive <i>kaps</i>	temporal <i>kaps</i>
<i>masin</i> 'about' <i>vra</i> 'on, at, about' <i>veraberyal</i> 'regarding, concerning' <i>šurj</i> 'on, with regard to, on the subject of' <i>hamar</i> 'for, about'	causal-concessive <i>kaps</i> <i>patčarov</i> 'because of' <i>hetevank'ov</i> 'as a result of' <i>handerj</i> 'despite' <i>šnorhiv</i> 'thanks to' <i>arit'ov</i> 'on the occasion of' <i>hamar</i> 'because of, due to'	<i>heto</i> 'after' <i>araĵ</i> 'before' <i>žamanak</i> 'during' <i>minč'ev</i> 'until' <i>naxk'an</i> 'before' <i>pes</i> 'as soon as' <i>i ver</i> 'since' <i>miĵoc'in</i> 'at the moment of' <i>ənt'ac'k'um</i> 'during' <i>pahin</i> 'in the instance of' <i>žamin</i> 'in the hour of'

TABLE 3

familiarity 'shared knowledge'		non-familiarity
factivity	non-factivity	
causal and concessive <i>kaps</i> with a person-marked infinitive (SNI)	temporal <i>kaps</i> with a person-marked infinitive (SNI)	purpose, conditional and modal <i>kaps</i> with a person- unmarked infinitive
thematic <i>kaps</i> with a person-marked infinitive (SNI)		thematic <i>kaps</i> with a person-unmarked infinitive